

A

LETTER

To the Most REVEREND the

John Potter

Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*,

Concerning the

**V A L I D I T Y
O F
L A Y - B A P T I S M ;
A N D O F**

*The Baptisms of those who never had
Episcopal Baptism nor Ordination.*

*Jer. vi. 16. Thus saith the L O R D , stand ye in the ways and
see, and ask for the old Paths, where is the good way, and
walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your Souls.*

2 Chron. xxvi. 16, ver. 22. Heb. v. 4.

LO N D O N :

Printed for R. MINORS, in St. Clement's Church-Yard.
M.DCC.XXXVIII.

[Price One Shilling.]



ADVERTISEMENT.

W^HOSOEVER has a mind to see the Doctrine of *Lay-Baptism* fairly stated, examined and confuted, may read what Mr. Laurence has written expressly upon this Subject in his *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, which has had several Editions. He shewed his firm Belief of what he wrote upon this Subject by his Practice, for he and his Children were Baptized, (not by the Hypothetick Form) in a publick Church in *London*, before a great Congregation, although they, all of them, had Presbyterian Sprinkling in their Infancy.

AND what Mr. Campbell has said of it in the Preface to his Book on the *Middle-State*, page xii, xiii, xiv.



A LETTER to the most
Reverend, his Grace the Lord
Archbishop of Canterbury.

MY LORD,

YOUR Grace's Character of being a knowing and learned Divine, of which you gave full Proof while you sat in the Divinity-Chair at Oxford, and the high Station in which you are now deservedly placed, makes me presume to beg your Grace's Solution of some Difficulties which occur not only to myself, but also to a great many more, who are true Sons of the Church of England, as reformed from Popery, concerning Lay-Baptism, and the Baptisms performed by such who never had Episcopal-Baptism nor Ordination.

WERE I the only Person who is puzled with these Difficulties, I would not presume to represent them to your Grace in this publick way; I would in that Case, have endeavour'd to satisfy my self, in the best manner I could, without giving your Grace the trouble of this Matter,

B

BUT

BUT when I found that several Learned Divines of the Church of *England*, Doctors in Divinity, Priests and Deacons, and even *Bishops* themselves, have of late Years, Preached, Written, and publickly Taught and Defended the *Validity* of *Lay-Baptism*, and of such *Baptisms* as are performed by *Teachers*, who never had *Episcopal Ordination* nor *Baptism*: And as a Consequence of this, several have been Ordained *Priests*, who may hereafter come to be *Bishops* of the Church of *England*, who have had no other *Baptism* but such as these; I thought it high time, humbly to propose to your Grace, the Difficulties which occur to us upon these Principles, and this Practice.

THIS I propose to do, by humbly offering to your Grace some *Queries*, the Answers to which, from one of your Grace's Learning, Judgment, Penetration, Candor, and high Station in the Church, will very much help to clear this Subject in it self; and we hope also to remove the Scruples about it, which arise from the above-mentioned Principles and Practice.

THE QUERIES are,

1. WHETHER is *Lay-Baptism* Valid?
2. WHETHER are the *Baptisms* of such who never had *Episcopal-Ordination Lay-Baptisms*?
3. WHETHER is the *Commission* given by JESUS CHRIST, St. Math. xxviii. 19, 20. Go-

ye therefore μαθητεύσατε, make Disciples of all Nations, Βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, given to His Apostles, and to those who should be Ordained by them to the end of the World ; or to the Apostles, and to all who should believe in him.

4. IF CHRIST gave it only to His *Apostles* and their *Successors*, and not to *All* who should believe in Him, how is *Lay-Baptism* Valid ?

FOR by this Text it appears, that the only instituted way of CHRIST's appointment for making *Disciples* to CHRIST, is by such *Baptism* as He then gave power to His *Apostles* to Administer by virtue of this His *Commission*. Which shews that it is of great Importance to the Christian Church to have *Baptism* duly Administred according to CHRIST's Institution, not only as to the *Matter* and *Form*, but also as to the *Administrator* who is of the *Essence* of *Baptism*, and which here appears to be confined to His *Apostles* and their regular *Successors*, for with such He promises to be alway, even to the end of the World.

5. IF such *Baptisms* as are performed by those who never had *Episcopal Ordination* be found to be *Lay-Baptisms* ; can *Confirmation* by a *Bishop* make up the *Defects*, unless it be allowed, that a *Non-entity* may be *Confirmed*, and that *Confirmation*, as now in use here is a *Sacrament*, which in its own nature is *equivalent* to *Water-Baptism* ; which if it were, how

then can both be necessary to be administered to the same Person ?

CONFIRMATION supposes the *Validity* of the *Baptism* which it *confirms*, being the *Completion* of it, and therefore cannot supply or make up any *essential Defects*.

6. DO TH the Church of *England* now, or did she always esteem and declare the *Baptisms* and other *Administrations* of either *foreign* or *domestick Divines*, who never had *Episcopal-Baptism* nor *Ordination* to be *Valid* ?

7. IF she does acknowledge the *Administrations* of such, why does she oblige all such to be *re-ordained* by a *Bishop*, before she acknowledge them as *Bishops*, *Priests* or *Deacons*, or capable legally of the *Cure of Souls*, or of *Livings* in *England* ?

THE French-Protestants indeed complain heavily of this, yet rather than not be admitted to enjoy *Livings*, they comply with it.

8. IF the *Consecration* of the holy *Eucharist* be confined by CHRIST's *Commission* to his *Apostles*, and their lawful, regular, *Episcopal Successors*, what *Text* is there in the *New Testament*, which allows of any other *Baptism* but such as is *administered* by the same *Order* and *Succession* to which the *Consecration* of the *LORD's Supper* is committed by CHRIST's *Commission* ?

9. IF *Lay-Baptism*, or the *Baptisms* performed by such who never had *Episcopal Ordination*, be *Valid*, why is it not as lawful for such *foro Conscientiae*,

Conscientiæ, to administer the holy *Eucharist* as *Baptism*? And if so, what signifies CHRIST'S *Commission* to His *Apostles*, &c. or His *Promise* of being with them alway, even to the end of the World, in the due exercise of that His *Commission*; if any one that pleases, who professes to believe in Him, may take upon him to Act, with as much *spiritual effect*, without being cloathed with, and empowered by that *Commission*, as if he were truly an *Apostle*?

CALVIN indeed did this, although as his Friend *Beza* acknowledges in his Life of *Calvin*, prefixed to his Works, he never had any sort of *Ordination* at all, neither *Presbyterian* nor *Episcopal*; nor did I ever hear that he had sufficient Vouchers, to prove that he was intrusted with an *extraordinary Commission*, therefore I must look upon him as an *Intruder*.

10. OR indeed what occasion is there at this rate for *Clergymen* at all, if without that *Commission* duly conveyed, all the *divine Effects* of it can be as well, as safely, and as certainly and effectually attained, as with it, or by it.

AND if *Lay-men* can thus *validly* administer *Sacraments*, they may with less difficulty be allowed to *preach*.

THIS brings it to what I heard a Doctor of Divinity of the Church of *England*, famous for *Pride* and *Criticism*, say, That *Episcopacy* is indeed a very convenient *Civil Institution*, and very fit for *England*, but cannot justly claim any *Divine Right*; and to prove this, he brought

brought an Instance from the *East-Indies*, which he strangely misrepresented, and the account he gave of it, he certainly knew to be false, as I could easily and convincingly shew, were there occasion for it.

11. How can this Doctrine of the *Validity* of *Lay-Baptism*, be cleared from being first established and instituted by the Church of *Rome*, after she became *corrupt* in *Doctrine*, *Worship*, &c. for she holds (and from her we have it) that the *Matter* and *Form*, that is *Water*, and the *Words* of the *Institution*, are so absolutely necessary to *Salvation*; that even innocent *Infants* cannot go to *Heaven*, without an application of them to them by *Baptism*; and therefore also holds, that if the Thing is done, it matters not by whom it is performed: And if the People amongst us who approve of *Lay-Baptism*, are not quite so severe to *unbaptized Infants* as are the *Romanists*, yet they seem to have less reason to approve of *Lay-Baptism* than even the *Papists*, if they are not.

If the case of *Necessity* be urged or insisted upon, I ask

12. WHAT is truly and properly a *Case* of *Necessity*?

13. WHETHER can any *Case* be so much and so truly a *Case* of *Necessity*, particularly in that of *Baptism*, as to make it lawful to *forgo* CHRIST's *Letters-Patent*, to *Usurp* upon His *Commission*, or to *apply* it to any other but such to whom He gave it.

AND

AND if the Popish Reasons, upon which they found *Lay-Baptism* in *Cases*, which they call *Cases of Necessity*, hold good, why may not such *Cases*, entitle *Lay-men* to administer the *Lord's Supper* also?

14. CAN such an *Usurpation* upon *CHRIST'S Commission* and *Authority* either *claim*, *expect* or *have* the same *spiritual Effects* by *Covenant*, as hath His *true Commission* rightly, truly, and *duly conveyed* and *executed* according to His *Institution*?

15. Is there no material Difference between the *Baptisms* performed by a *Schismatick* in a *Case* believed to be a *Case of Necessity*, who was *Ordained* by a *lawful Bishop*, and that of a *Schismatick* who never had *Episcopal Ordination*?

16. GRANTING then, that some Persons in the primitive times, who had been *baptized* by one who had *Episcopal Ordination*, though a *Schismatick*, were *received* into the *Church* by the *Imposition* of a *Bishop's Hands*, will this prove that the *Baptisms* performed by *Schismatics* who never had the *Power* or *Faculty* of *baptizing* conferred upon them, who never were admitted into *Holy Orders* by a *Bishop*; and who deny the *Order of Episcopacy* as *sinful*, as *heretical*, as an *Usurpation*, and who oppose it with all their *Might* by *Preaching*, by *Writing*, by *Persecution*, and sometimes by *Excommunication*, and sometimes also by *Fighting*, are *lawful* and *effectual*.

17. ARE

17. ARE those who are thus *baptized* by such *Anti-Episcopal Schismatics*, Members of *CHRIST's Church*, by the *Baptism of CHRIST's Institution*? Are they safe? Have they as good a Right and Title to the Privileges of *Church-Membership* in the *Covenant*, as they who have been *baptized* by such *Ministers* who have entered in at the *Door*, into the *Sheepfold* by *CHRIST's Commission*? St. John x. 1, 2. Heb. v. 4.

18. UPON what Principle can he who says that *Lay-Baptism* is *valid*, upon a *Case of Necessity*, say that it is *valid*, if there be no such *Case of Necessity*?

19. WHETHER is the *universal Practice* of the whole *Catholick Church*, during the purest Ages of it, or a much more *Modern Doctrine* and *Practice*, which owes its Establishment and Institution to proper corrupt *Popery* to be preferred?

20. WHETHER is the *Doctrine* of *Lay-Baptism* consistent with, and agreeable to the noble Standard of the Church of *England's Reformation from Popery*?

21. ARE the *Destinations*, *Appropriations* or *Dedications* to the *Ministry*, by any sort or set of *Lay-men*, or of such who never had *Episcopal Ordination* themselves, a sufficient *Call* to the *Evangelical Ministry*, however solemnly they may be dedicated thereto by such, and however learned, moral or otherwise qualified they may be, without an *extraordinary Commission well*

well vouched by Miracles, which can abide the Test, and can bear a strict Examination and Scrutiny? 1 St. John xi. 18, 19. 2 St. John ix. Heb. v. 4.

IT has been objected by some, who although they allow of a certain Sort of a Preference to *Episcopacy*, yet that a *Divine Command* is not sufficient to bind *ad semper*, unless GOD also declare that it is His Will that it should be continued for ever.

To this I think the Answer is easy, for if this *Rule* were to take place, the *Objectors* may free themselves from the *Obligation* of obeying all the *Laws* and *Institutions* of the *GOSPEL* which are not *enjoyed* with an express *Divine Declaration* of their being of *perpetual Obligation*, *Baptism* and the *LORD's Supper* not excepted. And I cannot help saying that this is too near of kin to *Socinianism*.

A QUAKER who understood *Greek*, once found me reading in a *Greek New Testament* St. John xi. he asked me what I was reading. And I put the Book into his hands, and he read ver. 24. where *Martha* said to *CHRIST*, *I know that he [Lazarus] shall rise again in the Resurrection at the last Day*. Upon which he said, just so thee art apt to mistake in what thee callest the *Institution* of *Baptism*, which *CHRIST* meant only to take place until *His Resurrection*, whereas thy People fancy that it ought to continue in Practice until the last Day. The Application is easy.

22. ARE the *Ordinations* of meer *Presbyters*, though *Episcopally Ordained* themselves, sufficient to entitle any Men to act as *Presbyters*, in the Church of CHRIST without a *Bishop*; since they received no such *Power* from the *Bishops* who *Ordained* them; and that they can have no such *Power*, unless it were given them by their *Ordainers*; and that no *Bishops* ever pretended to have such a *Power*, as to give it to any without a *Bishop*? more especially if such *Presbyters* do solemnly *renounce Episcopacy* as *sinful*, and in it self *damnable*, as not only having no foundation in *Scripture*, but also as being contrary to it, and as being *Popish*.

23. MAY not *Hypothetick Baptism*, when administered by a lawful *Episcopal Minister*, who is no *Schismatick* himself, and followed by the *Imposition of the Hands* of a true Catholick *Bishop*, be a proper Expedient to prevent Disputes, Scruples and Objections, as well as Un-easiness of Conscience upon Reflection, or on a Death-Bed, rather than *Confirmation* alone, especially if the 5th Query be duly considered?

24. DOES *Ordination* even by a lawful *Bishop*, make up the *Defects* of *Lay-Baptism*? or make them who are *Ordained Members* of CHRIST's Church in the way of His Appointment? Are they fit then to administer *Baptism* and CHRIST's *Supper* to others, who have not been *baptized* themselves according to CHRIST'S

CHRIST's Institution? Are they fit to Initiate others into CHRIST's Church, who were never duly Initiated themselves?

25. UPON what other Principle than that of the Validity of Lay-Baptism, can such Men, though so Ordained, administer Sacraments?

26. By what Rule then of Scripture or Antiquity does a Bishop take upon him to Ordain such? To the great Disparagement of Episcopacy, and Encouragement of all the Sects who are against it, which are thus hardened in their Error, and assisted to pull down, as they formerly did, that very Episcopal Church, of which they are Bishops, and which they are solemnly bound and obliged to support, both in Conscience and Honour, not to mention Interest.

If the Unchristianing (as some call it) of several Protestant Churches abroad be objected, I ask.

27. WHETHER is GOD to blame for giving us a Rule, from the Observation of which this may be inferred, or we, for not walking by GOD's Rule, be the Consequences what they will, for who can say unto God, What doest Thou?

ARE GOD's Laws to be broken to humour the Caprice of Men, especially such Men who may have Episcopal Ordination amongst them, if they have a mind, but chuse not to have it.

BUT leaving these Men to GOD's uncoveted Mercies:

28. Is it not evidently sinful and monstrous, and without any Apology to be made for it,

to neglect lawful *Baptism*, when easily to be had? Is not this to condemn GOD for giving the *Rule*, and preferring their own ill-founded *Sentiments* to GOD's *Institution*: opening a Door for *Popery*, *Infidelity* and *Scepticism*, can this be honestly called *Charity* or *Moderation*?

29. CAN the *Baptism* administered by a lawful *Episcopal Minister*, to one who had only *Lay-sprinkling* before, be properly called *Re-baptization* upon any other *Principle*, but that of the *Validity of Lay-Baptism*?

30. OR can the Use of the *Hypothetick Form* be honestly called *Re-baptization*, even if the Person to whom it is administered, had been rightly *baptized ab habente potestatem*, while there ariseth or remains any Scruple or Doubt about the Lawfulness of what was performed before, or of the Fact?

31. CAN an *Invalid Baptism* Initiate any one into the true *Catholick Church*, since it doth not initiate into any one *sound Branch* of the *Catholick Church*? For as a very learned Divine of the Church of *England* faith in answer to a Book written by a *Dissenter*,—“ he
“ ought to remember, that *Baptism* is the Initiation or Admission into the *Church*: And
“ I would willingly know, how a Man can
“ be a Member of the *visible Church*, and yet
“ be joined to no part of it? Can a *Member*
“ be joined to the *Body* all over, and to no
“ part of it? Or can a *Member* be joined to
“ the *Body* any other way than by being joined
“ to

" to some part of it? Can the *Foot* be joined
 " to the *Body* without being joined to the
 " *Leg*? Or indeed can it be joined to the *Body*
 " any other way but by being joined to the
 " *Leg*?—And thus in the *Church* or *Body*
 " of *CHRIST*, Christians are united to it by
 " being Members of some particular Church
 " or part of it. For how can they be joined
 " to it, who adhere to no part of it?"

IT is easy then to see who *Unchurches* such People, whether it is themselves, who are not, and will not be *initiated* according to *CHRIST's Institution*, and the agreeing *Practice* of the *Catholick Church*; or they who give them fair Warning of their *Danger*, for not being thus *initiated* into the *Church*.

By the way, I find that some of the *Presbyterian* Dissenting Teachers (particularly one *Hadfield* in his late Ordination-Sermon, which is full of Blunders and Perversions) who endeavour to perswade their Disciples that *Bishop* and *Presbyter* are the same, do refer to Sir *Peter King's* Book, intitled *An Inquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity and Worship of the Primitive Church, &c.* first printed at *London* 1691, as a full Proof of the Equality of the Order of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*; but he is so very unfair, that he takes no notice at all of a full and modest, but strong Answer to Sir *Peter's* Book, by a very learned and judicious Divine of the *Church of England*, entitled, *An Original Draught of the Primitive Church, &c.* *London*

1717. and which to my own certain Knowledge Sir Peter saw and read in Manuscript before it was printed, and had it then in his power to hinder the Printing of it effectually if he pleased ; but so fair was he, that he then gave up his own Book, which had then just had a second Edition, without asking Sir Peter's Consent, by one Bell a Dissenting Bookseller, thereunto moved by his Party, and Sir Peter returned the Manuscript to the Author with Thanks, and desired it might be printed, for it had convinced him of his Mistake. If such Teachers dealt fairly and were honest, they ought first to confute this *Original Draught*, &c. before they pretend to refer to, or build upon, Sir Peter's *Racovian Scheme*, which he like a good Man, gave up upon Conviction : and which were it to take place, effectually destroys *Presbyterian Government* ; for if the primitive Parishes, Districts, or, as they have been long called, *Dioceſſes*, were as large as Archbishop Uſher has convincingly proved them to be, there is an End of the Independant Scheme : but if they were as small in extent as Sir Peter's Book alledges, then there is an End of the *Geneva Plan of Government*. However the *Presbyterian Mother* and the *Independant Daughter* agree against *Episcopacy*, as do all the other Sects amongst us ; although they are at Variance and often at War amongst themselves, each of them at times and by turns pretending to be the only true *Christians* in the whole

whole World, and the only *Elect* who are capable of Salvation, exclusive of all others.

THESE are they who must not be told that they are in a wrong way, for fear of offending or unchurching them, which it seems is a *mortal* and *unpardonable Sin*, while the believing that the *forging* of CHRIST's *Letters Patent* to be lawful is esteemed true *Charity*, and to prefer a Prescription of about 200 Years and in a Corner, to one of full 1500 Years throughout the whole *Christian Church*, a *Duty*; but the softest Term I can give it, until better informed, is a great *FATALITY*. And if I knew but one single Instance of a Man's relinquishing an Error or *Heresy*, by telling him that he is in a very safe way, without such relinquishing, I should have the less to say against this sort of strange and unaccountable *Charity*, of which so many seem to be so fond.

AFTER due Consideration had of the foregoing *Queries*, and taking things at the very lowest.

SINCE we are commanded to give *Diligence to make our Calling and Election sure*, 2 St. Pet. i. 10. And that many do believe *Lay-Baptism* not to be *Valid*, and that no *Baptism* which is not *Episcopal* is *Valid*:

Is it not then much safer to make sure of our *Baptism* by, at least the *Hypothetick Form*, administered by an *Episcopal Minister*, than to run the risque of *not being baptized* according to CHRIST's *Institution*, by a neglect of it.

For

For the greatest Advocates for *Lay-Baptism* cannot honestly say, that being *baptized* by this *Form* is either *unlawful*, *unsafe*, *sinful*, or a *Disqualification* for *Holy Orders* at any rate, and we say that *Unauthorized* or *Lay-Baptism*, more especially *Anti-Episcopal Baptism* is not *Valid*; and that no *Unbaptized* Man ought to be admitted into *Holy-Orders*.

IT will be very charitable in your Grace to give Answers to these *Queries*, for all they who have Doubts about the Contents of them, and who find the *Ancients* and the *Moderns* differ so very much in fact, upon this Head of *Lay-Baptism* and the *Validity* of it, can take no better Method to be duly informed concerning it, than by applying to your Grace, the *Chief Bishop of England*, in whose Province they live, that you may instruct and inform them, and satisfy their Scruples: For it is not every one's Talent to read and understand the Books in several Languages, which might settle their Minds in this Case.

MY Lord, I have heard it often affirmed by Men of Learning, and of no small Figure in the Church, That the Church of *England* has never yet thought fit to declare herself, nor to make any *Decree* or *Canon* concerning the *Validity* or *Invalidity* of *Lay-Baptism*, but has left it open, which would in my Opinion, and in that of many more, be one way of declaring in favour of it, for thus I chuse to think rather than that the Church of *England* had

has Trimmed in this Point. But I humbly think they are very much mistaken, who take upon them to affirm this, because I find the contrary fairly proved by the learned Doctor Gibson (now the worthy Bishop of London) in his valuable *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani*, or the *Statutes, Constitutions, Canons, Rubrics and Articles of the Church of England, &c.* London 1713. Vol. I. Page 446. Cap. ix. where under the Head of *Private Baptism in the Church of England 2 & 5 Edw. VI.* after ordering, in two Paragraphs, " That People " should be admonished not to defer the Baptism of Children, and not to have it performed at home, follows,

" First LET them that be present, call upon God for his Grace, and say the Lord's Prayer, yf the tyme wyll suffre; and then one of them shall name the Chylde, and dippe him in the Water, or powre Water upon him, saying these Words,

" Let them that be present. In the Manuscript Copy of the Articles made in Convocation Anno 1575. the Twelfth is, Item, where some Ambiguity and Doubt hath risen among divers, by what Persons *Private Baptism* is to be administred; for as much as by the Book of Common-Prayer allow'd by the Statute, the Bishop of the Diocese is authorized to expound and resolve all such Doubts as shall arise, concerning the manner how to understand and to execute the things

" contained in the said Book : It is now by
 " the said Archbishops and Bishops expounded
 " and resolved, and every of them doth ex-
 " pound and resolve, That the said Private
 " Baptism in Case of Necessity, is *only* to be
 " ministred by a *Lawful Minister* or *Deacon*
 " called to be present for that purpose, and by
 " *none other*. And that every Bishop in his
 " Diocese shall take Order, that this Exposi-
 " tion of the said Doubt shall be published in
 " Writing, before the first day of *May* next
 " coming, in every Parish-Church of his Dio-
 " cese in this Province : And thereby all Per-
 " sons shall be inhibited to intermeddle with
 " the ministring of Baptism privately, being
 " no part of their Vocation."

THEN follows, " N. I baptize thee, &c.

THEN (as in the Office in the Common-
 Prayer-Book)

And let them not Doubt, &c."

" THIS Article was not published in the
 " printed Copy, but whether on the same ac-
 " count that the 15th Article was left out
 " (*viz.* because disapproved by the Crown) I
 " cannot certainly tell ; however the Ambigui-
 " ty remained till the Conference at *Hampton-*
 " *Court*, in which the King said, that if Bap-
 " tism was termed *private*, because any but
 " a lawful Minister might baptize, he utterly
 " disliked it, and the point was then debated,
 " which Debate ended in an Order to the
 " Bishops

" Bishops to explain it so as to restrain it to a
" lawful Minister.

" ACCORDINGLY, in the Book of Com-
mon-Prayer which was set forth that same
Year, the Alteration was printed in the Ru-
brick as I have noted them before, and o-
ther Expressions in other Parts of the Ser-
vice, which seemed before to admit of Lay-
Baptism, were so turned as expressly to ex-
clude it."

THIS I take to be a very strong Declaration
of the Church of *England* against *Lay-Bap-
tism*; for by *lawful Minister*, here can be
meant no other than one who has been Or-
dained by a *Bishop*, as appears by *Query 7th*;
and even the Cases, which by some are called
Cases of Necessity, are all here expressly excluded
both by the *Church*, by the *King*, and by the
Parliament. And so it continues to this Day,
although some overlook it, some will not see it,
and others are so attached to the Doctrine of the
Validity of Lay-Baptism, that they make no
scruple to oppose their *Mother* the *Church of
England*, with her *Decrees* and *Canons*, and the
Civil Powers also of *King* and *Parliament*.

AND this ascertains the meaning of these
Words [LAWFUL MINISTER] in the third
Rubrick, of Private Baptism of Children in
Houses; and also of the meaning of the
Word [LAWFUL] in the sixth Rubrick of that
Office, where it is applyed both to the *Minister*
as in the third Rubrick, and also to the *Matter*,

D 2 and

and to the *Words*, by which the Child was baptized, where I think it is plain that *By whom was this Child baptized?* relates to the *lawful Minister*; and *with what Matter and with what Words was this Child baptized?* The Word [LAWFULLY] relates to the *Matter and Form*.

BUT farther, my Lord, your Grace must certainly know that the *Dissenters* have now, for many Years, constructed the *Lenity of the Government*, in suspending the Execution of the *Penal Laws* against them, not only as a *Toleration*, which in effect it is, but also as that which sets them upon a *Level* with the *Regular Clergy* of the Church of *England*, in all respects, except that one, of their being capable of getting into *Livings*, to procure which Capacity, they have long had many Irons in the fire; and yet in their Endeavours, they strive to bring the Church of *England* down to their *Standard*, to their Terms, in hopes of their being as capable by Law of enjoying *Livings*, as are those who are *ordained by Bishops*. And the truth is, if their *Administrations* be as effectual, in the Sight of GOD, as are those of the *Episcopally Ordained Clergy*, I know no reason why they should not be freely admitted to equal Privileges with them.

THIS is what they have been long endeavouring to come at, and they have had some *Bishops*, and some *Archbishops*, particularly since the *Revolution* in 1688. to assist them most strenuously in this; which is very apparent from

from what was done by the means of your Grace's Predecessor Archbishop *Tillotson* in the Year 1689. an Account of which I had given me in Writing by a Clergyman who had it at *Lambeth*, where he often was, as follows.

1689.

" AN Account of the Proceedings of the
" Commissioners to prepare Matters for the
" approaching Convocation.

" THE Committee being met in the *Jerusalem-Chamber*, a Dispute arose about the Authority and Legality of the Court (the Bishop of *Rochester*, although he had so lately acted in an illegal one, being one that questioned it,) The Grounds of this Scruple were the Obligations the Clergy lay under by Act of Parliament of King *Henry VIII.* not to enter into any Debates about making any Alterations in Church-Affairs without the King's special and immediate Privacy and Direction first given concerning such Alterations. It was answered, that That must be done, either by an Act of the King's own Judgment, or by a private Cabal (both which ways would be very exceptionable) or else by his Majesties Commission to a certain Number of Ecclesiasticks, to consult about and prepare what was necessary to be altered, as it was in the present Case.

" FOR moreover the Commissioners pretended not to make these Alterations obligatory,

" ligatory, by virtue of a Law, but only to
 " get them ready to lay before the Convoca-
 " tion, the very Reports being not so much as
 " to be referred to the Privy-Council, lest
 " they might be subject to be canvassed and
 " cooked by Lay-hands. However the Bi-
 " shops of *Winchester* and *Rochester*, Dr. *Jane*,
 " and Dr. *Alridge* withdrew dissatisfied; and
 " the rest after a List of all that seemed fit to
 " be changed, was read over, proceeded very
 " unanimously and without Heats in deter-
 " mining as follows, (each Article as soon as
 " agreed on, being signed by the Bishop of
 " *London*,) viz.

" 1. THAT the chaunting of Divine Ser-
 " vice in Cathedral Churches shall be laid a-
 " side, that the whole may be rendered in-
 " telligible to the Common People.

" 2. THAT besides the Psalms being read
 " in their Course as before, some proper and
 " devout ones be selected for Sundays.

" 3. THAT the Apocryphal Lessons, and
 " those of the Old-Testament which are too
 " Natural, be thrown out, and others appoint-
 " ed in their stead by a new Calendar, which
 " is already fully settled, and out of which
 " are omitted all the Legendary Saints days,
 " and others, not directly referred to in the
 " Service-Book.

" 4. THAT not to send the Vulgar to
 " search the Canons, which few of them ever
 " saw, a Rubrick be made setting forth the
 " Usefulness

“ Usefulnes of the Cross in Baptism, not as
 “ an Eſſential part of that Sacrament, but only
 “ a fit and decent Ceremony; however if any
 “ do after all, in Conſcience ſcruple at it ſhall
 “ be omitted by the Priſt.

“ 5. THAT likewiſe if any refuse to re-
 “ ceive the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper
 “ kneeling, it may be adminiſtred to them in
 “ their Pews.

“ 6. THAT a Rubrick be made, declaring
 “ the Intention of the Lent-Faſt to conſiſt
 “ only in extraordinary Acts of Devotion, and
 “ not in Diſtinction of Meats.

“ 7. AND another to state the meaning of
 “ Rogation-Sundays and Ember-Weeks, and
 “ appoint that thoſe Ordained within the
 “ Quatuor Tempora do exercise ſtrict Devo-
 “ tion.

“ 8. THAT the Rubbrick which obliges
 “ Miſters to read or hear Common-Prayer
 “ publickly or privately every day, be changed
 “ to an Exhortation to the People to frequent
 “ thoſe Prayers.

“ 9. THAT the Absolution in Morning and
 “ Evening Prayer may be read by a Deacon,
 “ the Word *Priſt* in the Rubbrick being chan-
 “ ged into *Minifter*, and that thoſe Words *Ab-*
 “ *ſolution* and *Remiſſion* be put out, as not be-
 “ ing very intelligible.

“ 10. THAT the *Gloria Patri*, &c. ſhall
 “ not be repeated at the end of every Psalm,
 “ but

“ but to all appointed for Morning and Evening Prayer.

“ 11. THAT these Words in the Te Deum,
“ Thine honourable true and only Son, be turned,
“ Thine only begotten Son, honourable being only
“ a civil Term, and no where used in Sacris.

“ 12. THE Benedicite shall be changed into
“ the 128 Psalm, and other Psalms likewise
“ appointed for the Benedictus and Nunc Dis-
“ mittis.

“ 13. THE Versicle after the Lord’s-Prayer,
“ &c. shall be read kneeling, to avoid the Trou-
“ ble and Inconveniences of so often varying
“ Postures in Worship.

“ 14. AND after these Words, Give Peace
“ in our time O Lord, shall follow an Answer
“ promissory of somewhat on the People’s
“ part of keeping God’s Law, or the like, the
“ old Responie being grounded on the Prede-
“ tinating Doctrine taken in too strict an Ac-
“ ceptation.

“ 15 ALL High Titles or Appellations of
“ the King, Queen, &c. shall be left out of
“ the Prayers, such as most illustrious, Religi-
“ ous, Mighty, &c. and only the Word Sovre-
“ reign retained for the King and Queen.

“ 16. THESE Words in the Prayer for the
“ King, Grant that he may vanquish and over-
“ come all his Enemies, as of too large an ex-
“ tent, if the King engage in an unjust War,
“ shall be turned thus, Prosper all his righ-
“ teous

" teous Undertakings against thy Enemies, or
" after some such manner.

" 17. THESE words in the Prayer for the
" Clergy, who alone workest great Marvels, as
" subject to be ill interpreted by Persons vainly
" disposed, shall be thus, Who art the Author
" of all good Gifts, and in these Words, the
" healthful Spirit of Thy Grace, shall be, The
" Holy Spirit of &c. healthful being an Obso-
" lete Word.

" 18. THE Prayer which begins, O God
" whose Nature and Property, — shall be
" thrown out, as full of strange and imper-
" tinent Expressions, and besides, not in the
" Original, but foisted in since by another
" Hand.

" 19. THE Collects for the most part, are
" to be changed for those the Bishop of Chi-
" chester has prepared, being a Review of the
" Old Ones, with Enlargements to render
" them more sensible and affecting, and what
" Expressions are needful so to be Re-
" trenched.

" 20. IF any Minister refuse the Surplice,
" the Bishop, if the People desire it and the
" Living will bear it, may substitute one in
" his place, that will Officiate in it, but the
" whole thing is left to the Discretion of the
" Bishops.

" 21. IF any be desirous to have God-Fa-
" thers and God-Mothers omitted, and their
" Children

" Children presented in their own Names to
" Baptism, it may be granted.

" 22. ABOUT the *Athanasian Creed*, they
" came at last to this Conclusion, that left
" the wholly rejecting of it, should by Un-
" reasonable Persons, be imputed to them as
" *Socinianism*, a Rubrick shall be made, decla-
" ring the Curses denounced therein, not to
" be restrained to every particular Article, but
" intended against those that deny the Sub-
" stance of the Christian Religion in gene-
" ral.

" 23. WHETHER the Amendment of the
" Translation of the Reading Psalms, (as they
" are called) made by the Bishop of St *Asaph*,
" and Dr. *Kidder*, or that in the Bible, shall
" be inserted in the Prayer-Book, is wholly
" left to the Convocation to consider of and
" Determine.

" 24. IN the Litany, Communion-Service,
" &c. are some Alterations made, as also in
" the Canons, which I cannot yet learn so
" particular an Account of, as to give them
" you, with the rest, as perhaps I may here-
" after be able to do."

THIS is a true Copy of the Paper the Gentleman gave me, and the Original is now before me; but he died not long after he gave it me, so that I had no more from him.

AND although it appears by these Proceedings of the then Commissioners, who were to prepare matters for the then approaching Con-

vocation, that the Affair of a *Comprehension* was pushed as far as it could well bear at that time, yet for political, pretty obvious Reasons, it was then dropped, and did not again appear aboveboard for some Years thereafter. But there were not wanting, all that while several Men of high Character in the Church, who being fully bent upon it, were taking pains, underhand, to bring it to bear. And some of these Men have owned their Attachment to it, to myself, in Conversation; Dr. *Patrick of Eli*, in Particular. And Dr. *Burnett of Salisbury*, every body knows was fond of it. As was Sir *William Dawes* Archbishop of *York*, as appears from a Charge which he gave to his Clergy at a Visitation. I could name others also, if it were necessary.

THUS it is evident, That a Scheme of a *Comprehension* was deep Laid, and far Advanced, especially among the *Bishops*, by which there were to be very great Alterations in our *Liturgy*; and I cannot help observing, That when they were resolved to throw out some things which are Primitive, such as the *Cross* in *Baptism*, &c. and such things as the Body of the People had a great Attachment to, and would be most unwilling to part with, then their Pretensions to Devotion, and their Care of the People, run the highest. And when they could not invent a popular Pretence for the throwing out some things, they left them to

the Determination of the *Bishops*, whom they were sure of, as in Article 19th and 20th.

HOWEVER, there are three Articles which I do not pretend to except against ; these are the 15th, 16th, and 17th, But were I to see the Alterations they projected in the *Communion Service*, I am afraid I may, without Breach of Charity, conclude, That they were not such as would raise that Service nearer to the *Primitive Standard*, or to that of *Our Reformation*, for *Calvin* and *Zwinglius* were uppermost with them. Which shews a great Truth, That the Church of *England*, is not in near so much Danger from her open Profest Enemies, as from her false Friends, more especially from her *Bishops*, when they prove to be *Puritanical*, *Arian*, *Socinian*, *Infidels* or *Popish*. Some Instances of each of which have happened in my own time ; insomuch, That if the Lower Clergy had not withstood the Concerted Measures of the Higher, the Church of *England*, by this time, must have been modelled According to the Plan of *Geneva*, or even worse than that, Bad as it is.

ANOTHER Attempt was made in favour of a *Comprehension*, by the *Bishops* in the *Convocation*, which Met in 1712, by endeavouring to get that *Convocation* to declare in favour of *Lay-Baptism*, and for the *Validity* of the *Administrations* of both *Foreign* and *Domestic* *Divines* who had never been *Ordained* by *Bishops* : *Episcopal Ordination* being the great Barrier.

Barrier of the Church of *England* against all
Schismatics and *Intruders*.

This appears from hence.

SESS. 23, die *Mercur.* Maij 14. 1712.

" THE Lords the Bishops sent down the
" following Paper to the lower House of Con-
" vocation.

" FOR as much as sundry Persons have of
" late by Preaching, Writing and Discourse,
" possessed the Minds of many People in the
" Communion of our Church, with Doubts
" and Scruples about the Validity of their
" *Baptism* to their great Trouble and Dis-
" quiet.

" WE, the President and Bishops—of
" the Province of *Canterbury* in Convocation
" assembled, have thought it incumbent on
" us, to declare, in Conformity with the Judg-
" ment and Practice of the Catholic Church
" of Christ, as of the Church of *England* in
" particular, That such Persons as have al-
" ready been Baptized, in or with Water, in
" the Name of the Father, Son and Holy
" Ghost (although their *Baptism* was irregu-
" lar, for want of a proper Administrator)
" ought not to be baptized again. This We
" do to prevent, and (to use the Words of
" Archbishop *Whitgift* on this very point) not
" to bring Confusion into the Church (for
" let Men take heed, that they usurp not an
" Office whereunto they be not called, for
God

“ God will call them to account for so doing)
 “ but to teach Truth, and to take a Yoak of
 “ Difficulties from Men’s Consciences, and to
 “ resist an Error not much differing from
 “ *Donatism* and *Anabaptism*. ”

THIS your Grace will easily perceive, is a most wonderful Paper, and full of Contradictions; for these Right Reverend Prelates in it make the Administrations of those very Men whose Administrations they look upon as *Valid*, to be *Usurpers*, who must be called to account by GOD for their usurping an *Office*, whereunto they are not called; and yet they say it differs little from *Donatism* and *Anabaptism*, to call their Administrations in question; and consequently, that the Administrations, at least the *Baptisms* of such acknowledgedly *Usurpers*, have the same *Spiritual Effects* as have those of the lawfully called. O rare *Bishops!*

THESE *Bishops* also assert, that this their most inconsistent Declaration, is made in Conformity with the Judgment and Practice of the Catholick Church of CHRIST: This they ought to have proved, and the direct contrary of this, as learned Men as any of them were, have maintained and solidly proved, to my Satisfaction, and that of many more.

THEN as to what Conformity this their Declaration in favour of *Lay-Baptism*, hath with the Church of *England*, in particular, your Grace need not to be told, after reading what

what I have above transcribed from the Bishop of London's *Codex*, &c.

UPON the whole of these *Alterations* it may be asked.

First, IF such *Alterations* were to be made for the sake of the *Episcopal Church of England*, should she not have been first consulted, to know whether she desire it. The regular way of doing which, is by bringing the Question into a *Convocation*, before the *Bishops* had prepared such *Alterations* in her *Worship* for her.

Secondly, WHETHER her true Sons do dislike her present *Worship* and *Ceremonies*?

Thirdly, WHETHER the *Bishops* who took upon them to make these *Alterations* for her without consulting her, had the *Rule* of her *Reformation* always in their view, That she might be brought to still a nearer and more exact Conformity to the *Primitive Apostolical Churches*: Or, did they design to reform away all that is *Primitive* in her present *Constitution* and *Worship*?

BUT if these *Alterations* were designed in favour of the *Dissenters*, then it may be asked,

First, DID these *Bishops* know what will satisfy the *Dissenters*?

Secondly, HAVE the different *Sects* and *Communion* of *Dissenters* come to such an *Agreement* and *Coalition* amongst themselves, as to agree in what will satisfy all of them, since none of them ever

ever yet proposed any Terms of Union with the *Church of England*?

AND therefore, Thirdly, Whether it be possible in the nature of the Thing, so to satisfy them, as to make them desire to be *re-united* to the *Episcopal Church of England*; or to worship God in publick by a *Liturgy*, who have solemnly renounced and declared against *Episcopacy* and *set Forms*?

Fourthly, WHETHER the *Dissenting Teachers*, who have had no other *Ordination* but that of *Schismatical Presbyters* (so called) who can claim no *Succession* from any *Apostolical Church*, and who desire none, will be willing to vacate their present, and submit to *Episcopal Ordination* according to *Law and Canon*?

Fifthly, WHETHER if they do not thus submit, the admitting of them would not be a *Subversion* of the *Constitution*, not only of the *Church of England*, but also of the *Catholick Church* as far as we are able?

Lastly, WHETHER the true Sons, and other Members of the *Church of England*, ought not to be as tenderly regarded as *Schismatical Dissenters*, who agree amongst themselves in nothing so much as in the *Demolition* of the *Church of England*, as dire Experience hath shewed?

AND if these *Alterations* are designed in favour of *foreign Protestants*, and to keep them in Countenance, or with other political Views, ought it not to be considered, Whether we are obliged,

obliged in Charity to *unchurch* our selves by a *Union* with them ; and likewise, that none of them have any *Succession* from any *Apostolical Church* : Neither the *French*, *Dutch*, *Geneva*, nor any other of them, as themselves do freely acknowledge, with the Consequences of these things.

BUT to go on : The lower House of Convocation having on *May 14*.—“ Received from “ their Lordships (of the Upper House) a Pa- “ per relating to the *Validity* of *Baptism* ad- “ ministred by unauthorized Persons, did enter “ into a Debate thereupon, and thought it no “ wise proper to take into Consideration the “ Matter of that Paper, during the sitting of “ this Convocation concurrently with the pre- “ sent Session of Parliament, and have resol- “ ved to lay before their Lordships, some of “ their Reasons, for which they declined en- “ tering into the Consideration of the said “ Paper.

“ 1. BECAUSE the Validity of such *Bap-
tism*, is a Point which the Catholick Church,
“ and the Church of *England* in particular,
“ hath hitherto avoided to determine by any
“ Synodical Declaration. (See the Citation
“ from the Bishop of *London's Codex*.)

“ 2. BECAUSE the Inconveniences manifestly
“ attending such Determination, would in their
“ humble Opinion, far outweigh the Conve-
“ niencies proposed by it, especially at a time
“ when the Authority of the Christian Priest-

“ hood is so openly struck at by some : And
 “ the Advantage of an Episcopal Mission, de-
 “ rived by an undoubted Succession from the
 “ Apostles, is so undervalued by others.

“ 3. WERE it proper Synodically to con-
 “ sider and determine this Matter, yet they
 “ humbly conceive, That nothing of this
 “ kind ought to be done, but in a full As-
 “ sembly of the Clergy, after due notice given
 “ to all their Members, to attend and afford
 “ their Assistance on so important an Oc-
 “ casion.

“ THIS Paper was sent up to the Bishops.
 “ Sess. 24. die Veneris Maij 23, 1712.”

By this, your Grace may plainly see, That the *Bishops* at that time were in the Interest of the *Dissenters*, and were carrying on the *Comprehension* with all their Might, by endeavouring to procure a *Synodical Determination* in favour of *Lay-Baptism* : Which if they had obtained, it is more than probable, that we should have heard no more from any of their Lordships, of usurping the *Office* of the *Ministry* without a *Call*, or that a *Lay-Destination* would not have been in their Opinion, a sufficient *Call* to the *Ministry* ; for, in this Case, the very Men whom, for a Blind, I fear, they called *Usurpers*, would have been *Recti in Curia*.

IT is also apparent from these Papers, that the Lower House of *Convocation* made a noble stand against that very *Comprehension*, which

the then *Bishops* were promoting, to the Utmost of their Power, and which it is highly probable, their Lordships would not have attempted, if they had not been very sure that this same *Comprehension* was very agreeable to the then Court: For their Loyalty to the then Court, was so great, that they rarely adventured to displease It, either in Parliament or in Convocation; which was being more *Implicit* than became the Character of good *Protestant Bishops* of the Church of *England*, and a great *Draw-back* upon their Character, and for which their Memory is less admired by the true Sons of the Church of *England*, at this day.

I MUST however acknowledge, That I think the first Reason given by the Lower House of Convocation, is a very strange one, particularly because, as they were *Clergymen* of the Church of *England*, they ought to have known better, and that the Church of *England* in Conformity with the Catholick Church in the early, purer Ages of it did not leave it open. But even this Blunder shews, That they were desirous to disappoint the Puritanical Designs of the then *Bishops*, by all means possible.

AND, my Lord, there are several who do believe, That the *Opposition* then made to the *Comprehension*, by the Lower House of *Convocation*, and for which the then *Bishops* were so zealous, is the Cause why the *Convocation* has

not been allowed to sit, now for several Years, because the Government, prudently, foresaw, That such *Opposition* as was then made, might breed ill Blood in the Subjects. But the *Presbyterians* in *Scotland* have got the better, I do not say of the Ministry, but of the Church of *England* in this; For they are allowed their General *Assemblies* of their *Kirk* yearly, and not without some Expence to the Crown. And although they have no *Law* for their *Commission* of the *Kirk*, Cloathed, as they term it, with *Assembly Powers*, by which they have severely persecuted the *Episcopal* Clergy and People there, since their Establishment, yet they are in this Connived at, and they have Committed many *Barbarities*, too near of kin to the *Poppish Inquisition*, impunè. Whereas, if the *Commissioner*, who sits at their Head, do not allow them to appoint that *Commission*, before the *Assembly* is Dissolved by him, and which he may lawfully hinder them from doing, they have no right to *Sit*, nor *Act*, as they do, in the Intervals of their General *Assemblies*, and which if he did not allow them to appoint, would make them more *Tractable*, and would prevent their *Oppressions* for the future. This the late Marquis of *Lothian* did in the Year 1692. as I am told, for he Dissolved them before they could get their *Commission* Appointed, and he had thanks from King *William*, whose *Commissioner* he then was, for this, and who said, that the *Marquis* was a very fit Person
to

to Represent him, for he acted Prudently and Judiciously, and according to his Mind. Upon their Establishment, which was only upon the Inclination of the People in 1688, the Sting of their *Excommunications*, which formerly reached to Peoples *Estates*, was taken away, as propos'd by the then Lord Viscount *Tarbat*; and if their *Commission* were not Connived at, They would become very Tame.

Is it not very Strange and Unaccountable then, my Lord, That *Bishops* of the Church of *England*; should act so much out of Character, as to exert themselves to the utmost of their Power and Interest, to *Level* and *Degrad*e the Church of *England*, down to the *Plan* of *Geneva*, or the *Scotch Kirk*, by a *Union* with these *Uncommissioned Usurpers* of the *Priesthood*, who are, by Principle such mortal *Enemies* to the *Episcopal Order* ?

AND I beg leave, farther, to observe to Your Grace, That all the Steps which were then made towards a *Comprehension*, were all of them made, by *Levelling* the Church of *England* down to the *Dissenters*. Whereas I never yet heard that the *Dissenters* did rise one Step towards the *Episcopal Church of England*: For although the *Bishops* at that time, were so humble as to *Descend* to the *Dissenters*, by many Unprimitive, and Unwarrantable Steps, yet the *Dissenters* kept their Ground, kept Possession of their Old fundamental *Principle*, both

both in Theory and Practice, Not to Yield a hair's breadth to the Church of *England*.

I ALSO beg that Your Grace will please likewise to observe, That all the *Calvinists* abroad, and all the *Presbyterians* in *Great-Britain* and *Ireland*, do Declare against *Lay-Baptism*, and allow none to administer it amongst them, but their own Teachers. However, in this, we who are of the Church of *England*, and who look upon *Lay-Baptism* as *Invalid*, Differ from them, That we look upon all their Teachers, who have not had *Episcopal Ordination*, as meer *Lay-Men*, their *Lay-Destination*, &c. notwithstanding. But they believe them to be true Gospel Ministers.

To prove that the *Calvinists* abroad, and the *Presbyterians* at home, are against *Lay-Baptism*; I shall transcribe the Citations of a *Dissenting Teacher*, for from such I chuse rather to do it, than from one who is *Episcopal*, because it is a stronger Proof of what I Alledge.

MASTER *John Quick*, in his Introduction to his *Synodicon in Gallia Reformato*, or the Judgment of the *Reformed* concerning *Lay-Baptism*, Collected and Composed out of Original Manuscript Acts of the *French Protestant Synods*, Page vi. Sect. ix. tells us, That their first National *Synod* was held in the City of *Paris*, Anno Dom. 1559. in Chap. XI. p. 54. Under the Title of *Baptism*, there is this *Canon*. CANON 1. *Baptism* administered by

by an *Unordained Person*, is wholly *Void* and *Null*.

THE second National *Synod*, which was held at *Poictiers*, Anno Dom. 1560. Vol. I. Chap. VI. Article ii. p. 8. has this.

WHAT is to be done in Case a *Child* has been *Baptized* by a *Private Person*? Answer, To avoid the Scandal given, and taken, there shall be Sermons preach'd, for the better Information of the People, who shall also be Acquainted with the *Nullity* of such *Baptisms*; and that this may be imprinted upon their Hearts, the *Child* shall be brought publickly into the Church, there to *Receive true Baptism*.

Monsieur *Le Bailleur*, President.
Monsieur *Roland*, Scrib.

THE Brethren of GENEVA's Answer to a Letter concerning *Lay-Baptism*.

A R T I C L E I.

WE Ministers and Doctors in the Church of Geneva, accompanied with our Brethren come from the National *Synod* of Lyons, being met together in the Name of GOD, after that we had heard that Case of Conscience propounded to us, *Whether Baptism administered by private Persons, without Office in the Church of God, ought to be Reiterated or not*, did Unanimously declare this our Judgment, that *such Baptism did not in any wise agree with the Institution of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and therefore consequently is of no *Force, Power, Vali-*

Validity or Effect, and that the *Child* ought to be brought to the Church of GOD, there to be *Baptized*: For to separate the *Ministrion* of the *Sacraments* from the *Pastor's Office*; it is as if one should tear out a *Seal*, to make Use of it *without the Commission*, or *Letters Patents* to which it was Affixed. And in this Case, we must Practise that Rule of our Lord, *What GOD hath joined together, Let no Man put asunder.* This for and in the Name of all the *Assembly*.

JOHN CALVIN.

A R T I C L E III.

God has told us by his Son's own Word, who the Persons are that shall administer *Baptism*.

A R T I C L E V.

LAY-BAPTISM] is a *Counterfeit Baptism*, a mere *Mockery*, a *Profanation* of the *Sacrament*; to whose first *Institution* we must strictly keep. We do not *Reiterate Baptism*, for the *Pretended Baptism* is utterly *Unlawful*; yea, wholly Null. — In short, either Baptism is *Unprofitable* and Appointed to no purpose, or else it must be observed according to its *Primitive Institution*.

A R T I C L E VI.

LET no one administer it, who hath no *Call* from GOD to do it, it is all one as if an *Ape*, as he that hath no *Commission* to preach the *Gospel*, did administer it.

A R-

ARTICLE VIII.

WE never did confess that the bare *Sprinkling* of *Water* by one without a *Call*, or *Office* in the Church of GOD, was *Baptism*, or that it had its *Evangelical Form* there, where there was no *Evangelical Minister*.

ARTICLE IX.

WE repute as *Null* and *Void* this *Spurious Baptism* by *Private* and *Uncommissionated Persons*. And although we do not tie up the *Grace of GOD*, to the *Hand* of a poor *Man*; yet notwithstanding that, *Baptism*, must be annexed to his *Quality*, or else the *Authority* of *Jesus Christ*, must be trampled under *Foot*.

ARTICLE XI.

THE *Lord Jesus Christ* hath not rejected this *Sacrament*, nor wholly abandoned it to be dispensed by all Sorts of Persons whatsoever; but he hath Deposited a *Commission* with his *Ministers*, who are to *Dispense* it.

ARTICLE XIII.

THIS *Imaginary Baptism* doth not in the least *Signify*, or *Seal* our *New Birth*.

ARTICLE XIV.

IF a *Private Person*, who hath no *Call* from GOD, shall of his own *Will* and *Fancy* *Usurp* that *Office*, which doth not belong unto him, his *Baptism* is but a mere piece of *Farcery*, and therefore *Null*.

ARTICLE XVI.

WE deny — That the *Hand* and *Sign* of
G our

our *Lord Jesus Christ*, will be owned in the *Sprinkling of Water* by a Person *Uncall'd and Uncommissioned* by him.

A R T I C L E XIX.

WE say that *Popish Baptism* is Grounded upon the *Institution of Christ*, because the *Priests*, as perverse as they are, and totally *Corrupt*, are yet the Ordinary *Ministers* of that *Church*.

IN another *Article* it is said, —— THE Word *Re-baptize* is misapplied, since it was never questioned but that such an *Apish Trick*, as this *Mock-Baptism*, might be Reformed.

Peter Virrett, President of the Council.

THE first *Synod of Rochel*, Anno Dom. 1571.

Theodore de Beza, Minister of *Geneva*,
was Moderator.

N. des Gallars, and *De la Rougerage*, Scribes.

IN Chap. vii. Article 17. Page 97, it is said, That *Baptism* administered by a Person, who hath neither *Call* nor *Commission*, is wholly *Null and Void*.

THE *Synod of Gap*, Anno Dom. 1603.

WHERE, Monsieur *Chamier* was President, Monsieur *Ferrier Assessor*, Monsieur *Vignier*, and Monsieur *Roy* Scribes, Page 225, of the *Synodicon*, Vol. 1.

IN the vi Chap. Sect. 12. Page 239, it is said,
THIS Case was propounded ; a Proposant (*i. e.* a Candidate for Orders) never *Called* nor *Ordained* unto the *Ministry*, takes upon him to *Baptize* a Child, Is this *Baptism Valid*? This
Synod

Synod judgeth, That the Scandal given unto the People be carefully taken away, and for as much as *that Baptism* is of no force, the *Child* shall be brought into the *Church of God* by true *Baptism*, according to the Decision of the *Synod* of *Poitiers*.

THE third Synod of *Rochel* Anno Dom.

1607.

Monsieur *Beraut* Moderator.

Monsieur *Merlin* Assessor.

Monsieur *Andrew Rivet*, and

Monsieur *Roy*, Scribes.

VOL. I. Chap. i. Page 261, It is said in Chap. v. Sect. 18. Page 272. The Deputies of *Lower Languedoc* moved this Case, Whether Persons having, a long time, professed the true Religion, and coming to Understand they were *Baptized* only by a *Midwife*, ought to be *Re-baptized*? This Assembly judgeth, That they ought to be publickly *Baptized* in the Church of *Christ*, according to the *Institution* of our *Lord*, by a *Lawful Minister*, their former *Baptism* being wholly *Null* and *Void*, because done by *one*, who had no *Call* unto that *Office*.

By these Decisions of the foreign Protestants, it plainly appears, That in their *National Synods*, they have from time to time, Declared, All *Baptisms* to be *Null* and *Void*, which are not performed by such, as they called *Lawful Ministers*; and that they called such *Baptisms* a *Mockery*, a *Farce*, and *Apish Baptisms*.

IN the next place, here at home, That which the *Dissenters* call the *Assembly of Divines*, held in *Westminster*, allowed no *Baptism* to be *Valid*, that was not performed by a *Lawful Minister*; this appears from their *Directory*, and *Confession of Faith*.

AND Mr. *Tho. Edwards*, a rigid *Presbyterian Teacher*, in his *Gangræna*, gives an Account of the many *Heresies* and *Schisms* which sprung up after the *Rebels* had pulled down the Church of *England*: he says Page 24, *Error 106.* That it is an *Error*, and true *Anabaptism* for any to affirm, *That Baptizing belongs not to Ministers only.*

AND *Error 107.* *Baptizedness* is not Essential to the *Baptizer*, nor Essential to *Preaching*; so that Persons not only *not in Office*, but not so much as *Baptized*, may both *Baptize* and *Preach*.

I LEAVE the present *Presbyterians* to reconcile the *Lay-Baptism* for which they now so strenuously plead, with the *Synodical* and *Assembly Determinations* of both *Foreign* and *Domestic Calvinists* and *Presbyterians*, whose Successors they are.

AND with their Dearly-beloved Brethren, the true-blue Covenanted *Presbyterians* of the *Kirk of Scotland*, who have long ago, and also since the Revolution, acknowledged the *Confession*, the *Larger* and *Shorter Catechisms* of the *Westminster Assembly*. And as I am informed by an Act of their *Scotch General Assembly*, have obliged

obliged all their Teachers to Sign it, and in this their Confession of Faith, Article 27, It is said, *That Baptism must be performed, In the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, by a Minister Lawfully Ordained.*

ADD to this, that all the *Dissenting Teachers* in *England*, at this day, are obliged, and do subscribe to the 23d of the 39 *Articles* of the Church of *England*; for they are obliged to Subscribe to all of them except the 34th, 35th, and 36th, by the *Act of William and Mary*, which they call the *Act of Toleration*, before they can hold forth in a *Meeting-house*, and this 23d Article plainly Declares, *That It is not Lawful for any Man to take upon him, the Office of publick Preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent, to execute the same.*

Now by this it is obvious, that by these Words, *lawfully Called and Sent*, can be meant no other than an *Episcopal Mission*. And therefore they have concluded, That all and every other *Mission*, but what is *Episcopal*, must be *Null and Void*, in the sense of the Law, which by their *Subscription* they have acknowledged to be *Just*, or prove themselves *Dissenters* and *Hypocrites*, and therefore also their pretended *Baptisms* are *Null and Void*, and as being *Lay-Baptisms*, are *Invalid*, and should be Reiterated by a *Lawful Episcopal Minister*: Which yet by the *Synodical Determinations* of their *Foreign Brethren*, cannot be called *Rebaptization*.

SEE the Sense of the Church of *England* concerning *Episcopal Ordination* in the Preface to the Offices of the *Ordination of Deacons and Priests*, and the *Consecration of Bishops*.

AND now, my Lord, this brings this whole Affair of *Lay-Baptism* to this Issue, Whether these *Teachers*, who have not been *Ordained by Bishops*, are true *Gospel Ministers*, according to CHRIST's *Commission*, given to his *Apostles*, and to be continued in a right *Succession* to the End of the World; or only *Lay-men*, their *Destination*, &c. as in Query 21, notwithstanding. And this makes us, who believe these *Teachers* to be only *Usurpers*, the more solicitous to know your Grace's Sentiments, by unravelling the Difficulties which occur to us upon this Subject.

AND I think it is a remarkable Incident, That in the same Year that *Calvin* made himself *Pope* of his *Lay-Cardinals* at *Geneva*, *Ignatius* got himself made *Superiour* of his own Order, the *Jesuits* at *Rome*. This was Anno Dom. 1544. And these *Jesuits* have ever since been the *Janizaries* of the *Papacy*, and the *Lay-Elders* the *Janizaries* of *Presbytery*. And by the United *Malice* of these two, just a hundred Years after was the Church of *England* overthrown and destroyed, Anno Dom. 1641. So near of kin are the *Jesuits* and *Calvinists* or *Presbyterians*, at least in their Aversion to *Primitive Apostolical Episcopacy*, and in their *Politicks*, &c. And it is well known that

that the *Jesuits* were the *Authors of the solemn League and Covenant*, to which all true-blue *Presbyterians* in these Kingdoms adhere to this Day, when they dare own it. And the *Racovian Independency*, which was Nursed and Supported by *Oliver*, is only a *Spawn of Presbytery*, as it is a *Child of Popery*, which can with great Ease, if it had a Mind to do it, Destroy both *Mother* and *Child*, did not the *Church of England* stand in the Gap. For which, every one knows, how very Grateful all of them have been, and are to Her; and the *Quakers* were actually *Founded* by a *Jesuit* in the Year 1650, and consequently are such *Friends* to the *Over-indulgent Church of England*, as are the *Jesuits* who founded them, by Commission from the *Pope*, and his *College de Propaganda fide*. And in that very Year was born the Reverend Mr. *Charles Lesley*, whom GOD was pleased to make *His Instrument*, immediately and mediately of Converting above 20,000 of them from *Quakerism*, *Arianism*, and *Socinianism*. But to return,

THUS in effect the Members of the *Church of England*, who allow of *Lay-Baptism*, are the only *Protestants of Note*, who agree with the *Papists* in this *Doctrine*, (for I do not, in this Case, meddle with, or trouble myself about, the *Independents*, *Anabaptists*, or any of these other *Sectarians*, who sprung out of the *Calvinists*, as a *Reform* upon them.) Is it not strange then, my Lord, That there should be found

found in the Church of *England*, *Bishops*, *Priests*, *Deacons*, and *Lay-men*, who Coincide with *Popery* in this Doctrine, (from which we first had it here, and of which it is the Unreformed Remains) more than either *Calvinist* abroad, or *Presbyterian* at home ?

Is this for our Honour, my Lord ? Is *Leveling CHRIST's Commission* to His *Apostles*, down to a *Popular Call*, is the allowing of an Unwarrantable Unprimitive *Lay-Destination* of Men to the *Ministry*, and that their *Administrations* are Equal in all *Spiritual Effects*, with those who are called of God as was *Aaron*, as were the Successors of the *Apostles* in the beginning, and who derive their Succession from *CHRIST* and His *Apostles*, an approveable *Moderation* ? Are the Solemn *Institutions* of *CHRIST* to give place to the *Inventions* of Men ? Are *Modern Notions* to be preferred to *Primitive Truths* ?

I CANNOT help thinking that it is a *miftaken Charity* in several of the *Clergy* of the Church of *England*, to give countenance to; and make Apologies for the *Destinations*, and as they call them *Ordinations* of foreign *Divines*; for whatever Apology or Excuse may be made for the first *Reformers* amongst them from the Circumstance of Time and State Affairs when they first began to reform ; yet the Perseverance of their *Churches* in the *Abdication* of *Episcopacy*, considering that they have been long free from those Difficulties, and what they

they called *Necessities* which are pleaded in their behalf, yet it is certainly much more becoming the true *Charity* of any Christian *Bishop* or *Priest* earnestly to beseech them in the Spirit of Meekness, to return to that Form of *Ecclesiastical Polity* which JESUS CHRIST appointed by Himself, and by the Direction of His HOLY SPIRIT, for the standing unalienable *Government* of His *Church*, than to sooth them up in their *Error*, and devise *Shifts*, and as plausible *Arguments* as they can contrive against the *Authority* and *undoubted Practice* of the whole *Catholick Church*, to harden their *Teachers* and *Magistrates* in a Continuance of a sinful *Exorbitance* which they ought to redress;

Korab, Dathan and Abiram, who, with their *Company* were the first *Usurpers* of the *Priesthood*, had their *Apology* very ready to second their *Claim*, they pleaded *Holiness* when they set up against the Superiority of *Moses* and *Aaron* upon the (now modish) Principle of *Levelling* and *Disobedience* to their *Superiors*, whom GOD had set over them, Num. xvi. 8. I am sorry our *Dissenters* do the same, and they call their *Teachers* *Holy Men* of GOD, yet will not allow even the *Apostles* to be called *Holy* or *Saints*; and as a consequence of their pretended Holiness, they make their *Disciples* believe, that their *extemporary Prayers* are given them by the Inspiration of the HOLY GHOST, and therefore to be preferred to the

Barbarian

H

regular

regular well-digested *set Prayers* of a whole Church, yet I never heard any of their publick Prayers which did not make me think a Liturgy absolutely necessary.

Crudele est hic miserecordem esse.

IF these things be agreeable to, or consistent with the noble Rule of our *Reformation*, I confess my self, with many more, to be at a very great loss, and shall be glad to be better informed and instructed by your Grace, for whom I have a very great Honour.

AND I did sincerely rejoice at your Promotion, because you are a *Believer*, a *Christian*, and acknowledg'dly a learned Divine, (I wish to God I had the same Reasons to rejoice for several Promotions which have been made in the Church in my time.)

I BLESS GOD for it, That I am far from being of a persecuting Spirit, I am for making great Allowances for the Prejudices of Education, &c. I do not grudge *Dissenters* their *Toleration*, so far as *Conscience* is concerned, provided they would be contented with that, without endeavouring to undermine the *Episcopal* Church of *England*, by attempting to procure a *Civil Establishment* to themselves in opposition to her, without grasping at *Power* and *Preferrments*; if thus they could be satisfied, and be easy, much Good may their *Toleration* do them: But at the same time, I am strongly attached to the Church of *England*, as reformed from *Popery*, and wish to see the *Reformation* finished.

finished and perfected upon the same bottom, on which it was so judiciously founded; for your Grace need not be told, though several who may happen to read this Letter do, That the Rule of our *Reformation* was, the *Holy Scriptures* in the first place, and the agreeing Sentiments and Practice of the *early Fathers* of the Christian Church during the *Æra* of the *Charismata*, or of the *Illumination* of the *Holy Spirit of GOD*. This, my Lord, is my Standard, and from hence I flatter my self that your Grace will vouchsafe to set me to rights if you think me in the wrong, as living in your Province, and I shall be very thankful for your Instructions, which I humbly claim and crave, That if I am in an Error about *Lay-Baptism*, I may be convinced by the Solidity and Strength of your Grace's Reasons, founded upon the above-mentioned Rule of our Reformation. And if your Grace do convince me, I shall publickly retract, and think it my honour to yield to your superior Judgment.

I HEARTILY and sincerely wish your Grace a long Life and good Health, if it be the Will of GOD and the Apostolical *ταπποσια*, that you may, agreeably to your high Station in the Church, confute and convince the Enemies of our Holy Religion, that they may be converted, that their Eyes may be opened, that they may be turned from Darkness to Light, and from the Power of Satan unto GOD.

I ALSO wish your Grace may live long enough to do much good to the Church, and to provide reasonably and decently for your numerous Family, for I have not the least Fear or Apprehension, that however long it please GOD that you live, of your dying scandalously rich, as did your immediate Predecessor, and as did his Predecessor Arbbishop *Tennison* *, although he was a Man of great Learning, and had many great Objects of Charity in his Province, whom he did not relieve: While there are so many Widows and Orphans, and *Clergymen*, even in their Habit, daily begging in our Streets, as well as starving at home; and so many poor, but very industrious pains-taking *Curates* in your Province, who are not allowed more than can just to keep Soul and Body together, while they who employ them are living in Plenty, if not in Luxury, and going about idle, if not worse employed, in their Coaches, loaded with *Pluralities*, another of the unreformed Remains of proper Popery.

NOR

* For he is greatly belyed, if he did not die with a great Hoard of Money in specie under his Bed, it is said about 30,000*l.* However in this his Grace differed from other Hoarders, for they are commonly so fearful of losing their *Pelf*, that they can hardly sleep in quiet, whereas his Grace's Hoard proved an Opiate to him, for he sleeped sound when in Bed, and was not always awake when out of it. And I must say, that if this be the true Meaning of St. Luke xvi. 9.—*Make to your selves Friends of the Mammon of Unrighteousness, that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting Habitations;* I know none who have so good a Title to such Friends as have the *Misers* and *Covetous*.

NOR are these the only *Grievances* of which so many do most Justly Complain, even in *Parliament*, as Your Grace very well knows. And since the *Clergy* do not Love to have the *Laity* Interpose in such Cases, were it not well then, if the *Bishops* would *Reform* (I do not say themselves, but) their *Courts*; the *Oppressions* of which are the Scandalous Remains of proper *Popery*: And then they need not fear the Interposition of the *Laity*. But if they will not Reform *These*, and other Crying *Grievances*, they must expect that the *Laity* will do it for them, Sooner or Later, but, perhaps, in a way not so agreeable to the *Clergy*.

I AM for *Reformation*, but not for *Demolition*. The *Star-Chamber* was complained of as a great *Grievance*; it was not *Reformed*, but *Demolished*, and totally Suppressed: And the *Lay-Judges* were invested with all the *Powers* thereof, who if they have a mind, may exert all the *Powers*, which belonged to it, in as *Arbitrary* and *Oppressive* a manner, as ever the *Star-Chamber* did: Which when they do not, they shew that they are more *Moderate* in the Exercise of these *Powers*, than were those who were entrusted with these *Powers* before them; and their Regard to *Justice*, and the *Welfare of Society*.

BUT if the *Bishops* will *Reform* their own *Courts*, and the other *Grievances* complained of, themselves, they may then Retain what is

Just,

Just, Good, and Right, and throw out what is *Amiss*; and they may be sure that they shall have the Assistance of the *Laity*, to lend them a helping hand in so good a Work, to prevent such *Abuses* for the future, by proper *Penalties*, &c. enacted by Law. Nor can this well be doubted of, since the *Laity* has shewed a greater Disposition, and Forwardness to *Reform* these *Abuses* than even the *Bishops* themselves, hitherto.

AND the Abuse of *Excommunication*, can have no Apology, if we believe St. Paul, *1 Cor.* v. 5. Nor Extravagant *Fees* founded in *Covetousness*, nor the terrible *Abuse* of *Licences* for *Marriage*, which too often has produced great *Confusion* in Families, and has joined those together in *Matrimony*, who are within the Prohibited Degrees of *Consanguinity*, &c.

AND I cannot help thinking, That a *Clergyman's* being possessed of *Plurality of Livings*, upon each of which a Man may live Comfortably, while others are a Starving, is a Sort of *Spiritual Polygamy*, since in the Stile of the Ancients a *Pastor* was said to be *Married* to his *Flock*. Nor do I know any Reason why, by Analogy, to have a *Second Flock* added to a *First*, is not as truly this *Spiritual Polygamy*, not Lawful now under the Gospel no more than more Wives than one, as a *Second Bishop* in the same *Diocese*, (whom St. Cyprian calls *Nullus*,) is by the same Ancients called an *Adulterer*.

ALL Good Men do expect of Your Grace, because of your excellent Character, of which You have been very much Longer in Possession, than of Your high Station in which You now are, that You will heartily and in earnest set about this noble and Religious Work of *Reforming the Abuses* above mentioned, which will aggrandize Your Character, and make your Memory precious in all future Generations, for being the happy Instrument of bringing the Church of *England* up to the noble Standard of her *Reformation*, in so many Particulars as shall prove thus to be *Reformed*.

I AM aware that it may be objected against the *Bishops* Reforming the *Abuses* of their own *Courts*, &c. That they have not *Power* to do it of themselves without *Licence* from the *Crown*. And I shall allow the Validity of the Objection, as an Apology for their not Reforming such *Abuses*, when they have addressed the *Crown*, with due becoming Earnestness, as they may, and are then refused Power to do it. They have the Privilege of addressing the *Crown*, and *Parliament* also, as well as have other Subjects. And therefore, until they *do*, and are *Refused*, the Neglect of such a necessary *Reformation*, seems to lie at their Door.

I HAVE been very much encouraged to make this Application to Your Grace, upon the Subject of *Lay-Baptism*, because of your Judicious Determination, when Bishop of

Oxford, in the Case which was brought to You by the Reverend Mr. *Wesley*, who after that went to *Georgia*, who had made a Convert of a Presbyterian, who could not be easy, nor satisfy his Conscience without being *Baptized* by a Lawful *Episcopal Minister*. And Mr. *Wesley* Baptized him by the *Hypothetic Form*, with Your Grace's Approbation, and by your Direction, in *Lincoln College Chapel at Oxford*; and Your Grace confirmed him afterward at Your then Palace of *Cuddesden*, which Your Grace certainly would not have done, if the Man had not been first *Baptized* by an *Episcopal Minister*. And I take this *Hypothetic Form* of *Baptism* to be the very best Salvo, to prevent Disputes, and at the same time to do the generally necessary Thing effectually: and at present I think whosoever declines being *Baptized* by this Form, who has not been *Baptized* by a Lawful *Episcopal Minister* before, shews a Pride and Stubbornness, a Self-Sufficiency, &c. which are not good Qualifications for the Ministry.

AND until I be better informed, I cannot help thinking That the *Bishops* who do not enjoin it, and insist upon its being thus administered, in this Case, before Admission into *Holy Orders*, are to blame, are Unprimitive, and act inconsistently with the *Principles*, the *Decrees* of the Church of *England*, and the *Rule* of our *Reformation*, and the

Laws

Laws of the Land, and harden those they Ordain in false Principles.

FROM all which, Your Grace, I hope, will find it necessary to declare your Opinion in the Affair of *Lay-Baptism*, which if allowed to be *Valid*, may probably, in a few Years, supply us with a Bench of *Bishops*, whose *Baptism* is declared not *Valid* by the Church of *England*, in Conformity with the *Catholic Church of CHRIST*, in the purest Ages of it, and to the Rule of our *Reformation*, and which owes its Establishment to proper *Po-
perty*. I beg leave to Conclude with this, That since there never was a Time from *Adam* to *CHRIST*, and indeed for 1500 Years after, in which there were not some Men set apart by God's special Appointment to *officiate* as *Offi-
cers* in His *Church*, exclusive of all others, therefore it requires a very substantial and strong Proof to shew that the *Administrations* of the *Laity* in any Religious Case, can be as *Valid* or *Effectual*, as are those of the proper *Church Officers* of God's own *Appointment* and *Institution*, now, or so *binding* upon God by Covenant,

I am, My LORD,

Though unknown to your Grace,

Your Grace's most humble Servant,

PHILAETHES.

POSTSCRIPT.

I SHALL now lay before your Grace my *Conjecture*, for I call it no more, how *Lay-Baptism* came first to be thought of, or put in Practice, which I take to have been very soon after the failure of the *Charismata*, though it never had an Establishment nor an Institution, until the great Corruption of the Doctrines, Worship, &c. of the Primitive Church were so Increased, That proper *Papery* was introduced and established in the Western Church.

YOUR Grace well knows, that during the Æra of the *Charismata*, the Extraordinary Gifts of the HOLY GHOST, were then common to both the Clergy and Laity, and when a Clergyman was wanted, the way then was, to chuse from amongst the Laity such Persons as were of Good Report, and often, they who were possessed of one or more of these Extraordinary Gifts, were, for that Reason, preferred to any other, both from among the Laity, to the Lower Offices of the Ministry, and from them to the Higher. And although such of the Laity, who were thus divinely inspired, never did at all interfere with the Ordinary Ministry, for that had been Confusion, yet I think it cannot well be denied, that some of them, as well as the *Prophets* under the Law, acted sometimes by an Extraordinary well-vouched Commission, in some Cases.

This

This was the Case of *Ananias* with St. *Paul*, for I never read nor heard that *Ananias* was either Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, yet some I know have alledged that he was one of the *Seventy*, but I think without sufficient Authority. And it is highly probable, That several other Inspired *Lay-men*, did act by Extraordinary *Commission*, not only in working Miracles, but also as Ministers, in the absence of the Ordinary Ministers, in some Cases, especially when they could not possibly be come at, because of Persecution, Banishment, &c. and think it need not be doubted but that in several Cases, such as approaching Death, either Violent or Natural, such extraordinary inspired Officers, though only *Lay-men*, might have Extraordinary Commissions vouchsafed them, to supply the want of the Ordinary Ministers, and particularly, That they did Baptize, in the Cases abovementioned.

WHEN Corruptions got head, and that Primitive Purity was, in a manner lost, which it was, when the Clergy became (to speak it in the softest Terms) too *Secular*, when they came to be fond of *Riches* and *Power*, then the *Charismata* ceased proportionably, until at last it became a rare thing to find such Inspired People. And these Corruptions, and the Failure of the *Charismata*, seemed to be finished soon after the *Empire* became Christian. Then the new Generation which sprang up after this Failure of *Illumination*,

might remember to have heard their Parents tell, that either they themselves, or some whom they knew, were *Baptized* by *Lay-men*; but might not perhaps, tell their Children, that these *Lay-men* acted by an Extraordinary Commission, or if they did tell them, yet the Children knowing nothing of the *Charismata*, which then had failed, might take it for granted that such Baptisms had been administered by mere *Lay-men*, upon Extraordinary Occasions, without farther Examination, or Scrutiny, and therefore might think themselves safe, upon Extraordinary Occasions; such as when a Lawful Ordinary Minister could not be had, or upon the Prospect of Immediate Death, if a mere Lay-man, without an Extraordinary Commission, did Baptize their Children, and this Mistake at length was Established in, and by the *Roman Church*; which found out other Reasons for it, suited to some other of their Errors.

HOWEVER, my Lord, I propose this only as a Conjecture, which seems probable to me, because all the Errors that I know to be such, have Originated in Truths, of which they are the Perversion; and that not all on a Sudden, but Gradually, for *Nemo fit repente pessimus*.

St. IGNATIUS, who flourished Anno Dom. 101, in his Epistle to the *Smyrnæans* Saith.

ΠΑΝΤΕΣ

ΠΑΝΤΕΣ τῷ Επισκόπῳ ἀκολυθεῖτε. κ, τ, λ.

“ ALL of you follow your *Bishop*, as JESUS CHRIST the FATHER, and the Presbytery as the *Apostles*, and reverence the Deacons as the Command of GOD. Let no Man do any thing of what belongs to the Church, without the *Bishop*. Let that Sacrament be looked upon to be Firm, and Effectual, [or Good] which is administred by the *Bishop*, or *Him* to whom the *Bishop* has committed it. Wherever the *Bishop* is, there let the People be, as where CHRIST is, there the Heavenly Host is gathered together [*παρίστημεν*] It is not lawful without the *Bishop*, neither to *baptize* nor to consecrate the Feast of Love”. Of the same mind was *Tertullian* and *St. Cyprian*, and others, as it were easy to shew.

AND no body should expect a Decree of Council against *Lay-Baptism* during the Illuminated Ages, for then there was no such thing practised without an extraordinary Commission; and after that failed, Corruptions came in apace. The Romans were long a considerable People before there was any Law amongst them against *Parricide*, because there was no such thing committed amongst them; and I cannot help thinking that the Testimony of so early and illuminated a Father as was *St. Ignatius*, is preferable to the Decree of any Council after the *Charismata* had failed, or indeed after the first Council of Nice. A

*A SHORT APPENDIX, shewing the
Grounds of the Promotion of the
two last Archbishops of Canterbury.*

HAVING mentioned Archbishop *Tennison* and Archbishop *Wake* in the foregoing Letter, I think it is a piece of Justice owing to their Memory, to give the Reader a genuine Account of the grounds of their *Promotion*. That which follows of Dr. *Tennison*, I had from the good Countess of *Derby*, who was very deservedly a great Favourite of Queen *Mary*, who had obtained a Promise of her Husband King *William*, that if she should happen to outlive Archbishop *Tillotson*, he would allow her to name his Successor. When Archbishop *Tillotson* died, she accordingly claimed the Promise made her, and he asked her who she had a mind to succeed *Tillotson*; she answered Dr. *Stillingfleet*. No, said he, I cannot allow of him, but I will give you your choice of two, Dr. *Tennison*, or your old Acquaintance Dr. *Burnet*. That is a very hard choice, said she, That I must either have a *F—l* or a *K—e*. He answered, That his Affairs would not allow him to do otherwise. Then said she, if it must be so, I had rather have a *F—l* than a *K—e*, and accordingly Dr. *Tennison* was made Archbishop of *Canterbury*.

IN the next place, the ground of Archbishop *Wake's* Promotion, I my self, and several others

thers do know to be this. He was Chaplain to the Lord Viscount *Preston*, when Ambassador from King *James II.* to the *French* King, and begged leave of the Ambassador to make the Tour of *France*, which was granted him. During his Travels through that Kingdom, he pick'd up all the scandalous Stories he could meet with of *Monks*, *Fryars* and *Nuns*, to a considerable Number, and when he returned to *England*, he brought forth one of these Stories in every Sermon. This made him so very popular at that time, that I have known a Guinea given for one Seat in a Pew in *St. Ann's* Church, which was as full as it could hold when ever he preached, and I have seen the outside of the Windows crowded with Mob, who only wanted to see him, and could not hear one Word ; he husbanded these Stories so well, that they lasted 'till the *Revolution*, when there was no further occasion for them. The *Merit* of this was improved to his Advantage at the *New-Court* by his Friends, and then he was desired as being a very learned Man, which he certainly was, to write in favour of the *Regale*, which he did first in the Year 1697, and continued the Controversy for some Years after, against several learned Men, upon which he was made Bishop of *Lincoln*. When his first Book of the *Regale* came out, an old Acquaintance of his, a very learned Doctor of Divinity, made him a Visit, and asked him, how he who was so well acquainted

ed with the Writings of the early Fathers of the *Christian* Church, could write against what he very well knew was so opposite to their Sentiments. He answered, that he only wrote according to the Laws of *England*, but not according to the Sentiments of *Antiquity*. This I had from the Gentleman himself who visited Dr. *Wake* upon this occasion. And at last his Merit advanced him to *Canterbury*, where he lived *poorly* and died *rich*, which to be sure was never designed any Man should be, by those who endowed that *See* with so large a Revenue.

AND such *Grounds* of *Ecclesiastical Promotions* were unknown to the primitive *Christians*, and by the noble *Rule* of our Reformation ought to be so here. In those blessed Days, *Orthodoxy* in *Doctrine*, *Purity of Life*, *Charity*, with other *Gifts* of GOD'S HOLY SPIRIT, were the *Qualifications* required in the *Clergy*, and the *Grounds* of their *Promotions*. And thus it continued to be until the *Empire* became *Christian*, that the *Clergy* became *ambitious* of *Riches* and temporal *Power*, which lost them the *Charismata*, their *Orthodoxy*, &c. which produced a new and very bad sort of *Christianity*, under the Direction of the *Anti-christian Spirit*, instead of the *HOLY GHOST*, and this again in process of time produced proper *Po-pery*.

AND the same *Spirit* since the *Reformation* has produced *Calvinism*, with a long &c. of many—Ims; insomuch that if St. *Paul* were to make the Earth a Visit, I am afraid he would find

find but few, very few whom he would acknowledge to be his Disciples; in *Doctrine, Worship, Government* and *Discipline*, so great is the *Progress*, of the *Grand Apostacy*, which he foretold, 2 Thess. ii. and which is still upon the Increase. I pray GOD avert the fatal Consequences of this *Degeneracy*, for the sake of the SON of his LOVE, JESUS CHRIST, our Blessed Lord, Saviour, Advocate, and REDEEMER. Amen.

BUT although the *Grand Apostacy* begun early, and has been still advancing, and has made a considerable Progress, (even in my own time,) yet thanks be to GOD for it, every Age and Period has produced some good Men, both amongst the *Laity* and *Clergy* who have Remonstrated powerfully against the prevailing Iniquities of the times. And although I am sorry that I cannot Reckon the two above-mentioned A-Bs in this Number, yet all are not equally guilty; for some *Bishops* there are, and have been even lately, who were far from being *Covetous* or *Ambitious*, such as Dr. Sharp, A-B. of York; for he told me himself at *Bi-shopthorp*, that he did not save one Farthing of his Constant Yearly Revenue, and what he laid by for his Family, was only the *Fines* for Leases which dropped in his time. These he allowed his Wife to dispose of for the Use of their Children; yet he was so Hospitable, and gave so much in Corporal *Charity*, that, to my Knowledge, he often encroached upon

this his Family Fund ; and died well beloved by both the *Poor* and the *Rich*, not only of his own Province, but of all who were well acquainted with him. He never refused to assist any whom he knew to be proper Objects, or who were well recommended to him, to the utmost of his power. And he was particularly Careful of the *Clergy* under him, who had not a sufficient Maintenance, and who were not a few. A noble Pattern well worth Imitation. And yet his Revenue was but small, considering the necessary Expences of his Post.

THE Memory of all those *Bishops* who have risen fairly upon *Merit*, who walk Uprightly, Charitably, and as much as they may, Hospitably ; who are Orthodox in their Doctrine and Exemplary in their Lives, who are an Ornament to the Church, to their Character and Profession, who do their Duty, and in short, who live as they should, Vertuous, Holy, Unblameable and Resigned Lives, and die as they ought, will flourish and be much esteemed, and their Loss lamented by all Good Men after they are gone. *Psalm xxxvii. 37.*

WHEREAS the Memory of those who are of the opposite Character (once their Privilege of *Scandalum Magnum*, their only Security while Living, is over) they must expect the reverse, for no body will then flatter them; therefore Honesty is the best Policy.

5.0059
F I N I S.